UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/054,103	10/25/2001	Benjamin J. Parker	1689 (15724)	3674

33272	7590	11/08/2005

SPRINT COMMUNICATIONS COMPANY L.P.
6391 SPRINT PARKWAY
MAILSTOP: KSOPHT0101-Z2100
OVERLAND PARK, KS 66251-2100

EXAMINER
BATES, KEVIN T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2155	

DATE MAILED: 11/08/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *18 August 2005*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-7* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-7* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

Response to Amendment

This Office Action is in response to a communication made on August 18, 2005.

Claims 1-7 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Sitaraman (6427170) in view of Middledorp (5341496).

Regarding claim 1, Sitaraman discloses a method of managing user connection

sessions with a gateway in a computer network (Column 8, lines 23 – 28), said method

comprising the steps of:

storing user data on said gateway in response authentication by said user

(Column 8, lines 23 – 28);

storing user status information in a table in a RADIUS server during times that an

authenticated user session is established with said gateway (Column 8, lines 29 – 38;

Column 7, lines 8 – 12);

deleting said user status information from said table when said authenticated

user session is terminated (Column 8, lines 32 – 38);

said gateway routing said user traffic in response to said user data (Column 7,

line 65 – Column 8, line 12).

Sitaraman does not explicitly indicate detecting a failure of said gateway wherein said stored user data is lost;

said gateway sending a request to said RADIUS server to provide said user status information and user data corresponding to each user in said table; storing said user data on said gateway; and

said gateway routing said user traffic to continue said authenticated user session in response to said user data and said user status information without requiring re-authentication following said failure.

Middledorp teaches detecting a failure of said gateway wherein said stored user data is lost (Column 6, lines 38 – 41); said gateway sending a request to said server to provide said user status information and user data corresponding to each user in said table (Column 7, lines 10 – 13; Column 4, lines 55 – 63, where when a gateway fails, the objects that the gateway is managing are moved onto another gateway while the node is down, then when the gateway is restored it sends a message that the gateway is recovered and the objects it was managing are returned to the gateway); storing said user data on said gateway; and said gateway routing said user traffic to continue said user session in response to said user data and said user status information without requiring re-authentication following said failure (Column 4, lines 55 – 62).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Middledorp's teaching of network node recovery in Sitaraman's system in order to allow Sitaraman's system to recover from faults without having any downtown on the communication sessions.

Sitaraman also does not explicitly indicate that the gateway and the RADIUS server a running on separate machines, but Sitaraman discloses that the preferred embodiment has them on running on the same machine, but has different embodiments which they could be located on separate machines (Column 7, lines 7 – 10).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the gateway and RADIUS server on separate machines according to a possible embodiment in Sitaraman's disclosure in order to allow restarting of systems in case of failure without affecting the RADIUS server (Grant, Column 2, lines 46 – 65).

Regarding claim 2, Sitaraman discloses the method of claim 1, wherein said user status information includes an IP address assigned to said user for said session (Sitaraman, Column 8, lines 35 – 38).

Regarding claim 3, Sitaraman discloses the method of claim 1.

Sitaraman does not explicitly indicate said detecting step is comprised of a power-up initialization.

Middledrop discloses a system which detecting a failure happens when any type of failure occurs, the monitor realizes any type of failure has occur, then goes into the steps of recovery from said failure (Column 4, lines 43 – 47).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Middledorp's teaching of network node recovery in Sitaraman's system in order to allow Sitaraman's system to recover from faults without having any downtown on the communication sessions.

Regarding claim 4, Sitaraman discloses the method of claim 1.

Sitaraman does not explicitly indicate the step of requesting said RADIUS server
to provide said user status information and said user data is included in a boot-up
sequence of said gateway.

Middledorp discloses that the request is made to recover the connection
information in response to the recovery or reboot of the gateway (Column 7, lines 10 –
13; Column 4, lines 55 – 63).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the
invention was made to use Middledorp's teaching of network node recovery in
Sitaraman's system in order to allow Sitaraman's system to recover from faults without
having any downtown on the communication sessions.

Regarding claim 5, Sitarama discloses the method of claim 1.

Sitarama does not explicitly indicate that said user data comprises a host object
and a connection object.

Middledorp discloses that said user data comprises a host object (Column 4,
lines 3 – 12) and a connection object (Column 4, lines 30 – 49).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the
invention was made to use Middledorp's teaching of network node recovery in
Sitaraman's system in order to allow Sitaraman's system to recover from faults without
having any downtown on the communication sessions.

Regarding claim 6, Sitarama discloses the method of claim 5.

Sitarama does not explicitly indicate said step of storing user status information in the table is delayed until a connection object is created for said user.

Middledrop discloses a system in which said step of storing user status information in the table is delayed until a connection object is created for said user (Column 5, lines 1 – 20, where both connection and host objects are stored together in the same data structure and updated in the status table together).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Middledorp's teaching of network node recovery in Sitaraman's system in order to allow Sitaraman's system to recover from faults without having any downtown on the communication sessions.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sitaraman in view of Middledorp as applied to claims 1-6 above, and further in view of Zhang (6253327).

Regarding claim 7, Sitaraman discloses the method of claim 1.

Sitaraman does not explicitly indicate that said gateway is comprised of a service selection gateway.

Zhang discloses a gateway coupled to an AAA server (Column 6, lines 5 – 15). Zhang teaches that the gateway should be a service selection gateway (Column 5, lines 23 – 32).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Zhang's teachings in Sitaraman's disclosure in order to use

a protocol gateway that is able to give the client single sign in access to multiple

domains and destinations (Column 5, lines 26 – 32).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-7 have been considered but are

moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Kevin Bates whose telephone number is (571) 272-

3980. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 am - 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Saleh Najjar can be reached on (571) 272-4006. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

KB

KB
November 5, 2005

SALEH NAJJAR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER